

REPORT

ON

NATIVE PAPERS

FOR THE

Week ending the 6th June 1891.

CONTENTS:

	Page.		Page.
I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.		(e)—Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration—	
The Manipur papers ...	591	Administration of cattle-pounds ...	603
The trial of the Manipuri prisoners ...	ib.	The cattle-pound at Rayna in the district of Burdwan ...	604
The Manipur affair ...	592	The burning ghāt at Sanagar near Kalighat ...	ib.
Manipur ...	ib.	Roads in town Kumarkali in the Nuddea district ...	ib.
The question of the annexation of Manipur ...	593	The Dacca District Board ...	ib.
Lord Lansdowne's Manipur policy ...	ib.	The new Chairman of the Dacca Municipality ...	ib.
The capture of Tikendrajit ...	ib.		
The Manipur trials ...	594	(f)—Questions affecting the land—	
Tekendrajit and the annexation of Manipur ...	ib.	Nil.	
Manipur ...	595		
The Manipur question ...	ib.	(g)—Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation—	
Trial of the Manipuris ...	596	A road in the Uluberia sub-division, in the Howrah district ...	605
Manipur ...	ib.	A road from the Gulsī station to the Grand Trunk road in the district of Burdwan ...	ib.
Tikendrajit ...	597	The Dhakuria station on the southern section of the Eastern Bengal State Railway ...	ib.
Extension of the Indian Empire ...	ib.	A road in the Uluberia sub-division of the Howrah district ...	ib.
The letter of the Manipur durbar ...	598		
Lord Lansdowne and the Manipur affair ...	ib.	(h)—General—	
The Manipur trials ...	ib.	The Poverty Commission ...	ib.
Trial of the Manipuri prisoners ...	599	The Benares riot resolution ...	66
		The Benares riot resolution ...	ib.
		The Benares riot resolution ...	ib.
		The Benares riot resolution ...	ib.
		Mr. Sandel of the Post Office ...	ib.
		A postal complaint in the town of Barisal ...	ib.
II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.		III.—LEGISLATIVE.	
(a)—Police—			
The Police and the Deputy Magistracy ...	600	The Consent Act circular ...	ib.
The police in the Shambazar riot ...	601	The Consent Act ...	ib.
Thefts and dacoities in the Jessore district ...	ib.	The Consent Act ...	607
The police in the Shambazar riot ...	ib.	Extension of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act to the Mymensingh district ...	ib.
The late riots and police reform ...	ib.		
The Calcutta Police in the Shambazar riot ...	602	IV.—NATIVE STATES.	
Thefts, &c., in Bhastara in the Hooghly district ...	ib.	Nil.	
Thefts in the district of Barisal ...	ib.		
(b)—Working of the Courts—		V.—PROSPECTS OF THE CROPS AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.	
Mussulmans and the Independent Bench of Tangail in the Mymensingh district ...	ib.	Nil.	
A bad decision of the Allahabad High Court ...	ib.		
Babu Chandi Charan Sen, Muad of Munshigunge, in the Dacca district ...	603		
Babu Gopal Chunder Mukherji, Deputy Magistrate of Serampore ...	ib.		
(c)—Jails—			
Nil.			
(d)—Education—			
The Bengali language in the Calcutta University ...	ib.		
Rai Ramsunkur Sen Bahadur and the Calcutta University ...	ib.		
The dates of the next Arts Examinations ...	ib.		

	Page.		Page.
VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.		The Shambazar and the Benares riots ...	614
The religious agitation and its probable effects ...	607	The Rangoon burial ground question ...	ib.
Mr. Duke, the late Commissioner of Pegu ...	ib.	The Shambazar riot ...	ib.
"Why does all this happen?" ...	ib.	What is true loyalty? ...	ib.
Indian art and industry ...	608	URIYA PAPERS.	
The Nawab of Oudh's Emambarah in Metiaburj ...	ib.	Nil.	
The Queen ...	ib.	ASSAM PAPERS.	
Government and Hinduism... ..	ib.	Nil.	
The <i>Englishman</i> on the Shambazar riot ...	613		
Poverty of India under English rule ...	ib.		

LIST OF NEWSPAPERS.

No.	Names of newspapers.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.
BENGALI.				
<i>Fortnightly.</i>				
1	"Ahmadí" ...	Tangail, Mymensingh	600	28th May 1891.
2	"Hitakari" ...	Kushtea ...	800	
3	"Kasipore Nivási" ...	Kasipore, Burrisal ...	280	First fortnight of Jyaistha 1298 B.S.
4	"Navamihir" ...	Ghatail, Mymensingh	500	
5	"Sahayogi" ...	Burrisal ...	342	
6	"Uluberia Darpan" ...	Uluberia ...	700	28th May 1891.
<i>Weekly.</i>				
7	"Bangavási" ...	Calcutta ...	20,000	30th ditto.
8	"Banganivási" ...	Ditto ...	8,000	29th ditto.
9	"Burdwán Sanjivani" ...	Burdwan ...	335	26th ditto.
10	"Cháruvartá" ...	Sherepore, Mymensingh	400	
11	"Dacca Prakásh" ...	Dacca ...	2,200	31st ditto.
12	"Education Gazette" ...	Hooghly ...	825	29th ditto.
13	"Grámvási" ...	Ramkristopore, Howrah	1,000	1st June 1891.
14	"Hindu Ranjiká" ...	Beauleah, Rajshahye...	212	
15	"Hitavádí" ...	Calcutta	30th May 1891.
16	"Murshidábád Pratinidhi" ...	Berhampore	
17	"Navayuga" ...	Calcutta ...	500	28th ditto.
18	"Pratikár" ...	Berhampore ...	609	
19	"Rungpore Dikprakásh" ...	Kakinia, Rungpore	
20	"Sahachar" ...	Calcutta ...	800-1,000	27th ditto.
21	"Sakti" ...	Dacca	26th ditto.
22	"Samáj-o-Sáhitya" ...	Garibpore, Nuddea ...	1,000	31st ditto.
23	"Samaya" ...	Calcutta ...	3,000	29th ditto.
24	"Sanjivani" ...	Ditto ...	4,000	30th ditto.
25	"Sansodhini" ...	Chittagong	
26	"Sáraswat Patra" ...	Dacca ...	300	30th ditto.
27	"Som Prakásh" ...	Calcutta ...	600	1st June 1891.
28	"Sudhákár" ...	Ditto ...	3,100	
29	"Sulabh Samáchar" ...	Ditto	
<i>Daily.</i>				
30	"Banga Vidya Prakáshiká" ...	Calcutta ...	500	23rd ditto.
31	"Bengal Exchange Gazette" ...	Ditto	28th to 30th May and 1st to 3rd June 1891.
32	"Dainik o Samáchar Chandriká" ...	Ditto ...	1,000	31st May to 4th June 1891.
33	"Samvád Prabhákar" ...	Ditto ...	1,500	26th May and 1st to 4th June 1891.
34	"Samvád Purnachandrodaya" ...	Ditto ...	300	28th to 30th May and 1st to 4th June 1891.
ENGLISH AND BENGALI.				
<i>Weekly.</i>				
35	"Dacca Gazette" ...	Dacca	1st June 1891.
HINDI.				
<i>Monthly.</i>				
36	"Darjeeling Mission ke Másik Samáchar Patrika." ...	Darjeeling ...	50	
37	"Kshatriya Patriká" ...	Patna ...	250	

No.	Names of newspaper.	Place of publication.	Reported number of subscribers.	Dates of papers received and examined for the week.
Weekly.				
38	"Aryāvarta "	Calcutta	750	28th May 1891.
39	"Behar Bandhu "	Bankipore	500	
40	"Bhārat Mitra "	Calcutta	1,200	
41	"Champarun Chandrika "	Bettiah	350	
42	"Desī Vyāpāri "	Calcutta	
43	"Hindi Bangavāsī "	Ditto	1st June 1891
44	"Sār Sudhānidhi "	Ditto	500	
45	"Uchit Baktā "	Ditto	4,500	
URDU.				
Weekly.				
46	"Al Punch "	Bankipore	25th May 1891.
47	"Anis "	Patna	
48	"Calcutta Punch "	Calcutta	
49	"Gauhur "	Ditto	196	1st June 1891.
50	"Raisul-Akhbari-Moorshidabad "	Murshidabad	150	
51	"Setare Hind "	Arrah	
52	"Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat "	Calcutta	340	29th May 1891.
URIYA.				
Monthly.				
53	"Asha "	Cuttack	165	
54	"Pradīp "	Ditto	
55	"Samyabadi "	Ditto	
56	"Taraka and Subhavārtā "	Ditto	
Weekly.				
57	"Dipaka "	Cuttack	
58	"Samvad Vāhika "	Balasore	200	
59	"Uriya and Navasamvād "	Ditto	420	
60	"Utkal Dīpikā "	Cuttack	420	
PAPERS PUBLISHED IN ASSAM.				
BENGALI.				
Fortnightly.				
61	"Paridarshak "	Sylhet	480	
62	"Silchar "	Silchar	500	
Weekly.				
63	"Srihatta Mihir "	Sylhet	332	

I.—FOREIGN POLITICS.

THE *Sakti*, of the 26th May, has the following anent the Manipur papers published by the Government of India:—

SAKTI,
May 26th, 1891.

The Manipur papers.

The publication of the Manipur papers has been intended by the Government of India as an explanation to the world at large, and not simply to the Secretary of State, as has been commonly supposed. In this explanation the Government has tried to exonerate itself from all blame. But the writer sees that there was no necessity for the Government of India to give this explanation. For no one except the base and boorish Surachandra could be held responsible for the whole affair. It is surely Surachandra's fault that he was such a weak ruler. Why did he not, when deposed by Kulachandra, go directly to Brindabun as he had intended to do? Why did he give proof of his weakness by asking the help of the late Mr. Grimwood and by expressing a desire to return to Manipur? Why did he invoke the sympathy of the Government of India by saying that his position was being marked by the allied and feudatory Chiefs of India, who would carefully note whether or not Government delivered an ally from the machinations of his enemies? Surachandra should have known that the strong never sympathise with the weak, that tears never melt the heart of the valiant. The whole blame of the affair, therefore, rests with Surachandra. It is his fault that the State of Manipur is going to be subjected to foreign yoke for ever.

Many people are charging Government with publishing only a garbled account of the Manipur affair. But there is no sensible man who will not, under the circumstances, do precisely what the Government of India is stated to have done. The authorities have also acted very sensibly in not completely exonerating the officers who took part in that affair. Otherwise their version of the matter would hardly have gained the credence of the world. Taken altogether, the explanation given by the Government is a perfect one. The writer sees no ground for the clamour that has been raised against the Government of India by some newspapers and some members of Parliament.

There is apparently some ground for the charge of treachery brought against the Government and Mr. Quinton. There can be no doubt that Mr. Quinton's attempt to arrest Tekendrajit in the Durbar was, from the standpoint of strict justice, an unfair proceeding. But, considered practically, how else could it have been possible to secure the banishment of the savage Tekendrajit? A straightforward course would have involved the use of force, and if Government had used force it would have been blamed quite as much as it is being blamed now. All that can be said against the course actually adopted is that Government acted very indiscreetly in not sending a larger army to Manipur. The writer cannot also see anything to blame Lord Lansdowne for either in the proclamation of rewards for the arrest of the Regent and the *Yuvarāj*, or in the burning of some villages by the English.

Lord Lansdowne's critics would have themselves found it difficult to keep their heads cool if they had had to act under the horror and exasperation of such a massacre as that of Mr. Quinton and others. And considering that Lord Lansdowne, who has had to act under such circumstances, is yet a young man of unripe judgment, His Excellency is more to be pitied than blamed. His Excellency is a very unfortunate man; or Mr. Quinton and his party would not have been killed as they have been. Lord Lansdowne's own critics would have filled the world with his praise if Messrs. Quinton, Grimwood, and the rest had come back alive.

SAHACHAR,
May 27th, 1891.

2. The *Sahachar*, of the 27th May, asks, will not the same law which led to the acquittal of O'Hara apply to the prisoners in Manipur? The public executioner of Manipur says that he killed Mr. Quinton, Colonel Skeene,

The trial of the Manipuri prisoners.

and two others by order of the Senapati, and that Mr. Grimwood was speared by a kuki. But can there be any punishment on the unsupported evidence of this man? Of course, the writer does not like to see anyone take up arms against the Maharani, and he is sure that the power of Her Majesty should be upheld at any cost. But her honour and her reputation for impartiality must also be kept as intact as her power. Are the capital sentences which have been passed on some of the Manipuri prisoners justified by international

law? Peace has now been established in Manipur, and is it proper any longer to entrust the judicial function to soldiers ignorant of the law? Government should bear in mind that the eyes of all India and of all the Native Chiefs are now turned towards Manipur, and it should act in a way which will not impair its reputation.

URDU GUIDE AND
DARUSSALTANAT,
May 29th, 1891.

3. The *Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat*, of the 29th May, is anxious to know how Government decides the Manipur question. It is happy news for the people of India,

no doubt, that the troops are being withdrawn from Manipur, which means that their money will no more be squandered there.

BANGANIVASI,
May 29th, 1891.

4. The *Banganivasi*, of the 29th May, has the following:—

Manipur.

In appropriating another man's property it is not a point to be considered whether such appropriation is politically right or wrong. There is, indeed, nothing wrong in devouring another man's dominion, if one can only lay hold of it. This may be condemned as the policy of a mercantile people; but there can be no doubt that it is political policy, 'pure and unhusked.' Dive deeply into it, and it will be found to consist of nothing but injustice with a thin coating of justice—selfishness decked out with a big head-gear of altruism. Separate the coating, remove the head-gear, and the real thing will stand revealed.

It is perfectly useless to preach justice as the principle which should be observed in making arrangements for the future of Manipur. Manipur is a foreign State, where the prestige of our *Prabhus* (masters or lords) has been destroyed, and where, through a mistake of the Council Chamber, the British Lion has got severely whipped. Manipur has sent an entire Government to the other world. In Manipur has flowed precious blood from white beautiful bodies; that blood is not yet dry and will never be dry. As time is passing away, that blood is becoming thinner, warmer, redder and fresher. The Lion is trembling in anger and at the memory of the whipping he has received, and is roaring loudly for revenge for the insult he has received and the grief and humiliation he has suffered. With a terrible desire for revenge have been mixed unbounded vigour, unconquerable pride, mighty prowess and earth-hunger embracing the three worlds. His pride humbled, his honour tarnished, his heroism and political strategy condemned all over the universe, the Lion is making the sea-girt earth tremble at his roaring cry for 'revenge, revenge,' for 'blood, blood.' At such a time to advise him to do strict justice will be as vexatious and sarcastic as a love-song at a cremation. It is impertinence in the spiritual guide to preach spiritual wisdom to the disciple who is reeling, roaring and talking nonsense under the influence of wine. All things and affairs have their proprieties and improprieties, and strict justice had better not be preached in connection with love and politics. To be plain, we should be the last to advise the English Government to follow a perfectly disinterested policy in regard to Manipur; we should rather advise it to consult nothing but its own interests in dealing with that State.

Manipur is a foreign State, and the conquest of the whole sea-girt earth will hardly quench one's thirst for territory. The temptation to take other's territories is irresistible. And it is the more necessary that the Government of India should follow a selfish policy in regard to Manipur, because that State has been for it a scene of disgrace such as it never before received and cannot be quietly pocketed.

To turn to the moral side of the question of annexing Manipur. For the English to take or rob another's State will be no new thing in history, nor will it militate against any political principle. With the single exception of England, the English have no justly-acquired possession of their own. Theirs is an Empire formed of other people's possessions. And what is the large British Indian Empire itself to which it is indistinctly whispered that Manipur will be annexed? Is it Englishmen's own—'justly' their own? or a vast conglomeration of other people's States? What wonder then that little Manipur will sink and disappear in the vast British Indian Empire. Yes, Manipur can be easily taken, but it is feared that it will not be so easy to retain it. Any attempt to retain it will be fraught with danger to the Government; and Government should, not therefore, even upon considerations of self-interest, annex the State.

The following considerations should weigh with the Government :—

- (1) Manipur will be a fresh drain on the Indian Exchequer.
- (2) The reasons which hitherto stood in the way of the annexation of Manipur are the reasons which still make its annexation impolitic, and they are similar reasons to those which have dissuaded the English Government from annexing Afghanistan.
- (3) It will not be easy to keep the Manipuris in subjection, for they are all but a mountain people naturally impatient of foreign yoke.
- (4) Manipur is surrounded by wild tribes like Nagas and Kukis whom the Manipuris alone can keep in subjection.
- (5) The climate of Manipur will not suit Englishmen. Mr. Grimwood and his predecessors have said this. And it is not advisable that the English Government should go on sacrificing English officers in Manipur.
- (6) The cost that will be incurred in annexing the State, which extends over only a few bighas of land, will not be less than several crores of rupees, and the Indian treasury is not in a condition to sustain this heavy drain. Nor should the life-blood of the Indian tax-payer be thus squandered.

5. The *Education Gazette*, of the 29th May, says that Manipur forms a part of India, and it will not be improper to bring

EDUCATION GAZETTE,
May 29th, 1891.

The question of the annexation of Manipur.

it under the *khas* possession of Government, with the object of constructing a railway line through it

for the convenience of the people of India, Burma, and Manipur, in the same way as it is not improper to acquire a piece of land for the purpose of opening a communication between two houses. But the writer cannot approve of the statement made in some of the Anglo-Indian papers that, as the people of Manipur have not made a proper use of their country, it should be annexed by the English in order that it may be rightly used. This argument, if correct, will justify one man's taking possession of another man's property. If Government annexes Manipur, it should see that none of its inhabitants are deprived of their lands, that steps are taken to improve the indigenous arts and manufactures of the State, and that Manipuris born of respectable families obtain the right of entering the military and other services of Government, and that English manufactures, English capital and English enterprise do not find entrance into Manipur and improve its soil, but ruin its people.

6. The *Samay*, of the 29th May, says that there cannot be the least

SAMAY,
May 29th, 1891.

Lord Lansdowne's Manipur policy.

doubt that the Manipur policy of Lord Lansdowne is in the highest degree reprehensible. His Excellency is being blamed on account of this policy

both in England and in India. It is true Lord Lytton carried oppression to its maximum point, but what did not take place even during Lord Lytton's administration has taken place during the administration of the present Viceroy. Do not the Manipur affair and the fearful riot at Benares show that Lord Lansdowne's administration has annoyed the native Chiefs and dissatisfied and excited the loyal people of India? If His Excellency now gives up his desire of acquiring further territory and reinstates either Surachandra or Kulachandra, and behaves liberally towards Tikendrajit and the Manipuri prisoners, he may effect a partial palliation of his guilt. But will he do so? His Excellency ought now to act in accordance with the advice contained in a letter in the *Leeds Mercury* newspaper, written by that largeminded Lord Ripon, under whose administration the people of India lived so happily. The writer earnestly requests Lord Lansdowne to read the letter in question. It contains truth in every letter, and it ought to open His Excellency's eyes.

The capture of Tikendrajit.

7. Referring to the capture of Tikendrajit, the same paper observes as follows :—

SAMAY.

Tikendrajit was a powerfully built man, and yet when captured he was so weak that he could not stand on his legs. From this it is clear that he must have been very severely beaten by those who captured him. Now, are not the English responsible for this cruelty to Tikendrajit? There can be no doubt that the English are carrying cruelty to its maximum point in Manipur.

The story told by Englishmen themselves of the cruelties committed by English soldiers on the day on which they attacked the palace of Tikendrajit is a horrifying one. According to this story, when the soldiers occupied the ground floor of the Senapati's palace, the members of his household went up to the first floor and jumped down therefrom to save their lives and honour. But as they fell on the ground, the soldiers killed the helpless men, women and children with bayonet and musketshot. Do not Englishmen call this an act of barbarity? Tikendrajit is now guarded by no less than 40 Gurkha troops, and who knows how he is being treated by them?

SAMAY,
May 29th, 1891.

8. The same paper says that, though the deaths of Mr. Quinton and others have been caused by the foolishness of the Government of India and its reprehensible foreign

The Manipur trials.

policy, yet, instead of accepting the result as a consequence of its own sins, Government is trying to throw all the blame of the massacre on Kulachandra, Tikendrajit and other Manipuris. Reference is then made to the evidence of the two executioners, and the following comments are made:—

It is clear from their evidence that they were tutored. If the police can manufacture evidence in the very metropolis of British India, who shall say that it is impossible to procure a false witness in Manipur? The conquest of Manipur by the English and the miserable condition of their Maharaja have shocked and terrified the Manipuris. It is not, therefore, now difficult to procure witnesses who are prepared to give evidence against the Maharaja and Tikendrajit. That the two executioners are tutored witnesses is clear from the discrepancies in their evidence. At first Sajal Senba said that it was Iyen Kinna alone who came to call him, but Satabal said that he saw Sajal Senba alone. And which of them is to be believed? Sajal next said that as he was sitting in his house after having finished his evening meal Iyen came to him and said that he was required by Satabal. But Satabal said that at about midnight Iyen accompanied by a man came to him and asked him for the first time to procure an executioner. Sajal said that he had killed four Europeans, but Satabal says that he saw the dead bodies of five Europeans. Sajal said that he was trembling with fear, and yet it was he who, according to his own story, decapitated four Europeans, and that while they were in a standing posture! Again, as one man can decapitate five people, why would more men be sent for? If the evidence of the witnesses is believed, all the five men were killed by one man. And if more men were sent for, how is it that Sajal Senba alone executed them all? It can be easily believed that the English are manufacturing their stories. There is no doubt that every one of those men will be punished who, according to Satabal, were present in the durbar during the execution. Of course, those present in the durbar were respectable men, and it is these respectable men whom the English are anxious to implicate in the affair. From the time of the death of Mr. Quinton and his party till a few days after the English occupation of Manipur, everybody said that Mr. Quinton and his party met with their death at the hands of an infuriated mob. Accordingly, when the English army entered Manipur they found that the heads of the murdered officers had not been buried. But the story is now told that they were buried. Discrepancies of this nature make the evidence of the two executioners unworthy of credence. It is clear from their evidence that it has been procured with the object of punishing Kulachandra, Tikendrajit, &c.

SAMAY

9. The same paper says that it is not in the power of Government to say that it interfered in Manipur affairs with the object of punishing the rebellious brother of Surachandra. For, though it was at first willing

Tikendrajit and the annexation of Manipur.

to reinstate Surachandra, it afterwards changed its mind and had no objection to recognise Kulachandra as Maharaja. The English are very angry with Tikendrajit. The cause of the anger is that Tikendrajit was an influential man and a hero in the true sense of the word, and that Manipur was virtually under his rule; while Government, like Parasuram who exterminated the Kshatriya race 21 times, is anxious to see India denuded of all her heroes. Government has stated in so many words that it cannot tolerate that any one but itself should make and unmake kings in India. And as it was Tikendrajit who deposed Surachandra and placed Kulachandra on the throne, he incurred the anger and jealousy of the English, who did not think it prudent to allow

Tikendrajit to roam freely in Manipur like a tiger, and who therefore ordered his arrest by all means, fair or foul. They thought that if Tikendrajit was allowed a free hand in the affairs of Manipur, the State might prosper and its independence remain intact; and it was for this reason that they tried to get rid of him. Reference is then made to the *Pioneer's* correspondent's description of the attack on the Senapati's palace, and the following comments are made :—

It is clear from this description how miserably the Manipuris, who were armed with inferior weapons, fare at the hands of the English soldiers. The correspondent distinctly says that the English soldiers attacked the temple of the Senapati. Thus the statement made by the Maharaja Kulachandra in his letter to the Viceroy that the soldiers demolished temples, cruelly murdered men and women, and the Manipuris were compelled to take up arms against the English with the object of defending the honour of their relations and wives and children is true in every word. And what wonder that the Manipuris would be excited and would look upon the English as their enemy? What would Englishmen have said if the Manipuris had entered British territory as guests and then attacked the palace of the Viceroy? The Manipuris cannot therefore be blamed for their attack on the English. Why then are the English now anxious to annex Manipur? "O! Lord Lansdowne, O! thou who art the ruler of 25 crores of Indians, O! Viceroy, tell us why the people of Manipur are in such danger now and what is the sin for which they are now atoning? They were independent, and for what reasons have they been robbed of their independence? They did not attack English territory, nor did they shed much blood among themselves. Their only offence was that they set aside their weak ruler and put his brother in his place, and have they been ruined for this? Answer this question in order that your Excellency's own words may reassure us?"

10. The *Hitavadi*, of the 30th May, says that it is clear that when Sir William Hunter wrote justifying the conduct of Mr. Quinton, he had not seen the Manipur despatch

Manipur.

of the Government of India. The writer has carefully gone through the Manipur papers published in the *Gazette of India*, and noticed the want of one letter, the publication of which is likely to clear up a great mystery. It is hoped that Government will soon publish that letter. The writer cannot write with confidence on this Manipur question without seeing that letter.

The action which the Government of India has taken in connection with Manipur is inexplicable. If, for instance, Manipur was a feudatory State, why was not the same policy adopted towards it as is adopted towards any other feudatory State, and why have not the Senapati and others been tried in the manner in which Mulhar Rao of Baroda was tried? Again, if it was an independent State, why was it not treated as such, and why was an army marched into it without a formal declaration of war? So the action of the English Government in regard to Manipur is intelligible neither on the theory that it is a feudatory State, nor on the theory that it is an independent State.

Reference is then made to Colonel Johnstone's letter opposing the annexation of Manipur, and the following remarks are made :—

Colonel Johnstone's words are dictated by sound policy. The annexation of Manipur will strike terror into the minds of the native princes, decrease people's faith in the Queen's Proclamation and in Government's sense of justice, and create serious dissatisfaction in the country. No man with a sense of justice or conversant with politics will approve of the annexation of Manipur.

11. The *Sanjivani*, of the 30th May, institutes a comparison between Tikendrajit and Haidar Ali of Mysore. Haidar

The Manipur question.

deposed his master, the Hindu king of Mysore, and usurped his throne. Tikendrajit also deposed his brother Maharaja Surachandra, and intended to be the virtual ruler of Manipur with the help of his friend, the late Mr. Grimwood. The English Government waged war with the usurper of the Mysore State, and after Haidar's death succeeded in defeating his son Tippu Sultan and taking possession of Mysore. But instead of taking the State itself, it found out the lawful heir to the throne, a member of the old Hindu family, and made over the State to him. But, in Manipur, though the same Government has taken it upon itself to punish the enemies of

HITAVADI,
May 30th, 1891.

SANJIVANI,
May 30th, 1891.

the old Maharajah, it does not show any inclination to return the State to him, though His Highness has been standing before the Viceroy with clasped hands praying for justice from His Excellency. Has the English character become so depraved in the course of a century as to be quite incapable of rising superior to vindictive feelings and greed for territory? Cannot the English Government resist the temptation of "eating" only a few bighas of land? The representative of the old Hindu Mysore family had, as a matter of fact, lost all claim to the throne, and yet he was invited by the English Government of that day to ascend it when Tippu Sultan was defeated and killed. In the case of Manipur, however, though the English Government still perhaps acknowledges Surachandra as the Maharaja in official papers, yet it will not return him his small territory. Have then Englishmen of the present generation become so mean-minded as to suffer themselves to trample justice under foot out of revenge for the murder of Mr. Quinton and others by the dacoits? The writer can hardly believe this. Manipur is a petty State, and it is hoped that, instead of annexing it, the English Government will make it over to the old Maharaja. The annexation of Manipur will not redound to the glory of the British Government, while its restoration to the old Maharaja will greatly increase its popularity and make it great in the eyes of God.

SANJIVANI,
May 30th, 1891.

12. The same paper says that though there is no denying that great cruelty was perpetrated by the Manipuris in the massacre of the English officers, still it must at the same time be admitted that the English too on their part were guilty of the worst form of treachery. The very despatch sent by the Government of India to the Secretary of State tells clearly of treachery on the part of the English, and even implicates the Government of India in Mr. Quinton's treachery. It is only proper, therefore, that the trial of the Manipuri offenders should be conducted in an open court of justice, and that they should be allowed the privilege of defending themselves by counsel. It ought to be carefully ascertained whether the murders were committed under provocation, and what the share of each offender was in the perpetration of the crime. It would be contrary to all principles of justice and good government to hang the offenders upon the testimony of hangmen or people of a similar class. The best course to adopt under the circumstances would be to bring the offenders to Calcutta and commit them for trial to the High Court instead of having them tried by a court martial at Manipur. The course suggested will leave no ground for suspicion of injustice even if all the offenders, from the highest ruler of the State to the lowest individual, are sentenced to be hanged. The people of India are unwilling to see their Government suspected, in however slight a degree, of the commission of injustice.

DACCA PRAKASH,
May 31st, 1891.

13. The *Dacca Prakash*, of the 31st May, refers to the capture of Tikendrajit, and says that Englishmen's love of truth and justice, their large-heartedness and national reputation are now about to be tried. To do justice to a fallen enemy is even more glorious than obtaining a victory. Tikendrajit and the other Manipuri prisoners should, like the late Mulhar Rao, be tried by a mixed Commission consisting of Englishmen and natives.

Reference is then made to the letter written by the Maharaja of Manipur to the Viceroy, recounting the atrocities which are alleged to have been committed by English soldiers, and the following remarks are made:—It contains some very grave accusations against the English soldiers, and there should be a careful enquiry to ascertain whether those accusations are true or false. If this is not done, the writer will never say that Government has done justice to the prisoners in Manipur. The contention of Government and its advocates like the *Englishman* newspaper that Manipur is not an independent State cannot be admitted. The writer has looked into Sir William Hunter's Gazetteer, Mr Aitchison's Treaties and Sunnuds, and Elphinstone's works, but has found nothing which can prove the contention of Government. Government has always recognised Manipur as an independent State, and never interfered in its succession. Latterly it has exercised undue control over its affairs, and once or twice the rulers of Manipur asked for English help, but these things do not mean that Manipur was tributary to Government.

14. The *Bengal Exchange Gazette*, of the 31st May, says that Tekendrajit has been captured, or has given himself up. According to the Editor of the *Pioneer* newspaper, who is

Tekendrajit.

a tried friend of the natives, Tekendrajit should be hanged without delay. If the expression, without delay, means without trial, then the Editor may as well not have made that statement. The three soldiers who are trying the prisoners require no encouragement from the *Pioneer* in the matter of hanging Manipuris.

BENGAL EXCHANGE
GAZETTE,
May 31st, 1891.

15. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 31st May, makes the following remarks in the course of an article headed "Extension of the Indian Empire":—

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
May 31st, 1891.

After the Sepoy Mutiny was over, the Queen issued the following proclamation:—"We hereby announce to the Native Princes of India that all treaties and engagements made with them by or with the authority of the Hon'ble East India Company are by us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained, and we look for the like observance on their part. We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions, and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others."

It is clear from this proclamation that Government is bound to respect all the treaties and engagements which were made with Manipur by the Hon'ble East India Company. The annexation of Manipur will therefore be a violation of that proclamation, whilst there is no doubt that such annexation will excite fear and discontent among the Native Princes. But then the proclamation says that no aggression on British territory would be permitted to be made with impunity, and it is on the strength of this part of the proclamation that an attempt is being made to ruin Manipur. But the following considerations will show that this attempt is unjust:—

- (a) The durbar of Manipur made no aggressive attempt upon British territory and injured no British interest in any other way. On the other hand, it is the English officials who have made an aggressive attempt upon the Manipur State and injured the rights of the Manipur durbar.
- (b) The English are the guilty party and not the Manipuris. Under the treaty with Manipur, the English can take only 100 soldiers with them to Manipur, but Mr. Quinton went there with 500 soldiers.
- (c) No one from Manipur came to arrest any English official, but an English official went to Manipur to arrest the Jubaraj-Senapati under orders from the Viceroy.
- (d) Mr. Quinton went to Manipur to injure the interests of that State, and the people of Manipur only defended themselves.
- (e) The English, and not the people of Manipur, are to blame for the engagement which took place there between the two armies.
- (f) Mr. Quinton and others would not have been killed if the English had not been guilty of trespassing into Manipur territory.
- (g) The people of Manipur would have been guilty of violating their treaty engagements with Government if they had murdered Mr. Grimwood without cause before Mr. Quinton had marched his soldiers into Manipur. Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Quinton were the first to violate treaty engagements. In Her proclamation Her Majesty has expressed a desire that all Indian Princes will look to the interests and well-being of their respective subjects. But this certainly gives no right to any of Her officials to interfere in the internal administration of a Native State under the pretext of establishing good government there, or to bring it order the khas possession of the English. Whether or not the Cashmere policy of Government is in unison with the Queen's proclamation is a question which is yet to be decided.

But the pretext which was brought forward in connection with Cashmere cannot be brought forward in connection with Manipur. The English Political Agents in Cashmere always condemned the durbar's administration, but the English Political Agents in Manipur always spoke favourably of the Manipur

administration. Manipur is, as a matter of fact, a well governed State, and its people are happy and contented under their own rulers. Mr. Grimwood all along said that the people of Manipur were not dissatisfied with the new regime, and any attempt to reinstate Surachandra would lead to trouble. This view was endorsed by the late Chief Commissioner of Assam. Thus Lord Lansdowne had no pretext for interfering in the affairs of Manipur. Lord Dufferin was a man of foresight, and he did not therefore interfere in the internal administration of Nepal. But Lord Lansdowne is a short-sighted man, and he has interfered in the affairs of Manipur.

Under treaty, whoever ascends the throne of Manipur, Government is bound to recognize him as Maharaja, and up to this time it has fulfilled this engagement. There were revolutions in the State on more occasions than one, but Government always abstained from interference. What led it to interfere this time?

No other Governor-General of India was so foresighted as Lord Canning, and Lord Canning used to say that any attempt to convert the Independent States of India into tributary power would jeopardise English supremacy, and this is what is practically taking place now-a-days. No ruler of India ought to disregard Lord Canning's advice. The annexation of Manipur is sure to produce a commotion among the Native Chiefs.

SOM PRAKASH,
June 1st, 1891.

16. The *Som Prakash*, of the 1st June, refers to the letter addressed to the Government of India by the Manipur durbar recounting the atrocities which are alleged to have been committed by English soldiers, and hopes that Government will prove the charges contained in the letter to be false, and thereby remove the stain which will otherwise attach to its name.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
June 1st, 1891.

The letter of the Manipur durbar.

17. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 1st June, has the following:—

The ruler of India who prefers the policy of Lord Dalhousie to that of Lord Canning will be sure to involve the country in a danger like the Sepoy Mutiny. Lord Ripon himself says this. The English Government was endangered by Lord Dalhousie, and it required a Canning to save it. It is high time that the authorities sent out to India a ruler who, like Lord Ripon, could appreciate and put into practice the policy of Lord Canning. The policy of Lord Lansdowne's Government has filled the country with anxiety, and it cannot be confidently said that the country will not soon be involved in danger. Lord Ripon's warning should not be disregarded, for the writer has no hesitation in saying that Lord Lansdowne is quite unfit to rule India.

The Anglo-Indian editors are advising Lord Lansdowne to follow in the footsteps of Lord Dalhousie, and adopt towards Manipur a policy similar to that made use of by the latter in the case of Multan. It is easy no doubt to advise the annexation of Manipur, or even to annex it. But the evil effects of such annexation will not be easily prevented or averted. No sensible Englishman will say that the policy which in the hands of Lord Dalhousie produced such evil consequences will not produce evil consequences in the hands of Lord Lansdowne.

Lord Lansdowne would not have been placed in his present critical position if Mr. Quinton and others had not lost their lives in Manipur. The sensation caused in England is due solely to these murders. Parliament, it is clear now, will not at all interfere in the trial of the Manipuri prisoners. If it had showed any inclination to do that, the Government of India would not have dared to have those prisoners tried summarily by a court-martial. All that Parliament will concern itself about is the murder of the English officials. It will, it cannot be doubted, call Lord Lansdowne to account for the loss of their lives. Under what moral or political principle, then, does Parliament allow Lord Lansdowne, who is himself a culprit at its bar, to conduct the trial of the Manipuri prisoners! The people of India fail to understand the anomaly.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA
June 2nd, 1891.

The Manipur trials.

18. The same paper, of the 2nd June, has the following:—

It is not known on what evidence the correspondent of the *Pioneer* has implicated Tangal, Tekendrajit, and Kulachandra in the crime of the massacre of the English officers. Nor is there any probability that the *Pioneer's* correspondent's reasons for so doing will ever be known to the world. And the mystery of their trial by a court-martial will also ever remain unknown to the world.

Nor will the world ever have faith in a trial in which the accused is not tried by a jury or by assessors, and in which he is not allowed to make his defence through counsel. Indeed, it is not likely that the world will ever regard with confidence or feel any respect for the form of trial which sentenced thousands of men to death after the Sepoy Mutiny, in the name of which General Hill killed lots of Cabulis after the Afghan war, and which was made use of by the English Government in Burmah. It is idle to expect therefore that the world will have any faith in the same form of trial in Manipur.

Neither is the Viceroy nor is the Secretary of State much exercised about the credibility or otherwise of the evidence which is being adduced against the Manipuris. All that they want is to carry their own point. The whole country, nay, the whole world, may condemn their action, but they will care very little for that. The old Tangal General may therefore be already taken to be doomed. Nor is there any hope that the life of either Kulachandra or Tekendrajit will be spared.

According to the *Pioneer's* correspondent, Mr. Quinton and the other English officers were killed after a consultation between Tekendrajit and the old Prime Minister Tangal General. But this version of the occurrence is contradicted by others, who say that these officers were killed after Tekendrajit and Kulachandra had left the durbar-room of the palace.

But whichever the true version of the affair may be, the military authorities now in Manipur appear to disbelieve the latter. Tekendrajit's fate therefore appears to be already sealed. There is no evidence, it is true, to implicate Kulachandra in the massacre affair, but there is little doubt that he too will be held indirectly responsible for it; and so he too will be held guilty. Why then this farce of a trial, when the offenders will not be allowed to make any defence? It is not proper to make a farce of such a serious affair. Nor is it at all clear under what international law the English Government has taken upon itself to try the ruler and the heir apparent of an Independent State. So far as any existing law or precedent is concerned, the English appear to have no authority whatever to try them. The English may indeed kill an enemy weaker than themselves, but have certainly no authority to try them.

But since both the Viceroy and the Secretary of State will tell the British public that the course they are adopting in Manipur is one which it is absolutely necessary to adopt for the purpose of consolidating the Indian Empire, it is not probable that any objection will be made to it in Parliament. Indeed, there is hardly any member now in Parliament able to prove rightly whether the adoption of the course which is being pursued in Manipur by the Government is one that is really calculated to consolidate the foundations of the Indian Empire.

There is little hope, then, for the lives of Tekendrajit and Kulachandra, unless Lord Lansdowne himself condescends to save them. Will his Lordship hang them too as common murderers?

Most people are now saying unreservedly that the present complications in Manipur are to be laid entirely at the door of Lord Lansdowne and the late Mr. Quinton. That history too will hold them, and only them, responsible for those complications is perfectly clear. But, alas, it will be too late to mend or repair when history will pronounce against the justice of the course which is now being pursued. It behoves his Lordship, therefore, to act with great coolness. His Lordship's reputation is already marred, and if he does not soon mend himself, it will be irretrievably lost. It should be also remembered that the reputation of the whole British nation now depends upon the reputation which Lord Lansdowne can make for himself.

Trial of the Manipuri prisoners. 19. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 3rd June, has the following in connection with the trial of the Manipuri prisoners:—

The public ought to be informed of the nature of the evidence on which the Manipur prisoners are being convicted and of the character of the men who are giving that evidence. Reports of the trial should be circulated daily. One or two impartial correspondents should have been stationed in Manipur. As for the *Pioneer's* correspondent, the public have not the least confidence in his impartiality, and what he says is mere echoing of the officials. And how can people believe him, Hinsaman (envious man) as he is?

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
June 3rd, 1891.

According to the correspondent of the *Pioneer*, Mr. Quinton and his party were going towards the Residency from the durbar, but as they reached the gate they found an excited mob there, and therefore returned and took shelter in the durbar. Other people have also told this story, and there is no harm in believing it. The correspondent says that as the party were returning to the durbar room, Messrs. Grimwood and Simpson were speared, and Mr. Grimwood fell down dead. Many people say that the two officers were speared by Manipuri soldiers who were maddened by the outrageous conduct of the British soldiers and their officers, and the man who has been hanged for the murder of Mr. Grimwood did not incriminate anyone else. No one has yet said that either the Jubaraj or any of the ministers of the durbar had anything to do with the murder of Messrs. Grimwood and Simpson. After the murder of those two officers, Mr. Quinton and his party were detained in the durbar room for two hours; but the correspondent cannot say definitely by whose order they were detained. No one is therefore responsible for this detention. They may have hid themselves in the durbar room with the object of saving their lives. According to the correspondent, they were brought out of the durbar room two hours later and killed one after another. But no unsupported statement of this nature can be trusted. Perfectly unquestionable evidence ought to be adduced in support of this statement.

The writer cannot believe the correspondent's story that after a consultation with the Tongal General, the Jubaraj approved of the order of execution passed by the former. Tekendrajit knew well what the consequences of executing the English officers would be, and the writer cannot therefore make up his mind to believe that he approved of the Tongal General's order. It is also said that after approving the order, Tekendrajit went to serve the guns and again came to see whether Mr. Quinton and his party had been killed or not. Evidence of this nature cannot stand cross-examination. Why is not Tekendrajit given the services of counsel? The writer cannot consider the evidence adduced against the Tongal General to be of an unimpeachable character.

But Tekendrajit need not be guilty even if the Tongal General be proved so. It will not be just to condemn him on the unsupported evidence of either the Tongal General or any of the prisoners, for they can be made to say anything. Cannot that happen in Manipur which is happening every day in the British Indian Courts? The correspondent will not let go even Kulachandra. He says that during the execution of Mr. Quinton and his party, Kulachandra was within the palace, and he might have prevented the execution if he had wished to do so. "Now, you yourselves say that all power was in the hands of Tekendrajit, and Kulachandra was a puppet in his hands, and yet you now say that Kulachandra could have prevented the execution if he had wished to do so?" By thus trying to involve Kulachandra in trouble, the correspondent has proved his own envious nature. But whatever that may be, it is certain that the correspondent only echoes the military officials, and so he has no hope that justice will be done to the Manipuri prisoners.

II.—HOME ADMINISTRATION.

(a)—Police.

SAMAY,
May 29th, 1891.

20. The *Samay*, of the 29th May, complains that the high executive officials of Government now show a tendency to interfere in the acts of Deputy Magistrates. These latter have three masters to serve, namely, the District Superintendent of Police, the Magistrate, and the Inspector-General of Police. The police in the mofussil is notorious for oppressions, and when any of its servants, say a constable, is tried and punished by the Deputy Magistrate, the District Superintendent of Police comes down upon him, uses his influence with the Magistrate with whom he is often on terms of great intimacy, and tries to involve him in trouble. The Magistrate, relying on the *ex parte* statement of the Police Superintendent, calls for the records of the case, writes a condemnatory note, and thus insults the Deputy Magistrate. The writer wants to know whether it is proper to interfere with the acts of the Deputy Magistrates in this way. The public ought to agitate on the subject, otherwise police oppression in the mofussil will become simply intolerable.

21. The same paper says that the conduct of the police in connection with the Shambazar riot has shown clearly that when opposed the police becomes mad with rage and loses its sense in its eagerness to be avenged.

The police in the Shambazar riot.

When the rioters would have been able to repel its attack it did not advance, but when they fled, it made indiscriminate arrests. The *Mahomedan Observer* has learnt that the higher police officers ordered the arrest of all bearded men indiscriminately, and that in pursuance of this order many innocent men have been arrested. It is even said that the police committed oppression on helpless Mahomedan women. It is hoped that Government will cause an enquiry to be instituted into the matter and punish the guilty. It will be a very serious thing if even a single charge is proved against the police.

SAMAY,
May 29th, 1891.

22. The *Bangavási*, of the 30th May, says that thefts and dacoities are often taking place in Manirampore in the Jessore district. A dacoity was lately committed in the house of a *Subarnavanik* in the village of Noajani within the jurisdiction of thana Kotwalia. The man was so severely beaten by the dacoits that he died from the effects of the beating.

Thefts and dacoities in the Jessore district.

BANGAVASI,
May 30th, 1891.

The police in the Shambazar riot.

23. The *Hitavádí*, of the 30th May, has the following on the Shambazar riot:—

The riot has proved the worthlessness and incapacity of the Calcutta police. That fearful affair would not have occurred if the police had possessed practical ability and good sense. How is it that it took no notice of the fact that during the whole of Friday, preceding the riot, thousands of Mahomedans armed with *lattis* and other weapons kept up assembling near the *musjid*? The leader of the detective force was present on the scene of the riot, and gave evidence of great courage and self-sacrifice; but he might have prevented the riot by a little exercise of his naturally sharp judgement on the day preceding the disturbance.

One thing more. When assistance was sent for from the fort, how is it that the Military authorities sent some infantry instead of a body of cavalry? If they had sent some horsemen, two or three hours' time would not have been lost, and some blood-shed might have been prevented.

HITAVADI,
May 30th, 1891.

24. Referring to the several riots and disturbances that have lately taken place in Calcutta and other parts of India, the *Sanjiváni*, of the 30th May, says that the

The late riots and police reform.

Government is greatly mistaken in thinking that the only effective means of preventing such breaches of the peace is to increase the Volunteer corps of the country. Under this wrong impression the authorities are exerting themselves to the utmost to induce the Europeans and Eurasians to join that corps in large numbers. But it ought to remember that it was these very Europeans and Eurasians who professed open hostility to Government only a few years ago on the occasion of the Ilbert Bill agitation. And would it be safe to place arms in the hands of such men? May not these very men turn against Government if at any time they find their own interests jeopardised? But if Government is determined to arm these men, it should also enlist educated natives as Volunteers, or there is no knowing what revolution well-armed Europeans and Eurasians will bring about in the country. The remedy the Government has hit upon appears worse than even the disease itself. It fails to see that the real cause of this lawlessness is the corruption and utter inefficiency of the police. Indeed the police administration of the country has become totally paralysed, and it is this paralysed condition of the police that has made the *badmashes* throughout the country so bold; for it should be remembered that neither the Benares nor the Shambazar riot was the result of anything like religious excitement. These were only disturbances created by hired *badmashes*. It is said that in the Shambazar affair *badmashes* were hired at eight annas per head.

SANJIVANI,
May 30th, 1891.

Government seems to be under the impression that it is impossible to reform the police. But remembering that Indian soldiers, who are recruited from the same class of men as the constables, are about the best soldiers in the world, it seems rather strange that police reform should be considered an impossibility by the Government of India. Better salaries, a proper system of discipline, and the employment of educated men in the higher posts, will make Indian constables as honest and efficient as their brethren in the army.

It is a mistake for the Government to suppose that men dressed in hats and coats become valiant soldiers as soon as muskets are put into their hands. No ; such men will rather become a new source of danger to the Government.

SANJIVANI,
May 30th, 1891.

25. The same paper bestows on the Calcutta police the highest praise for their conduct in the late Shambazar riot. Government should reward those men who displayed exceptional valour in that affair, and should grant pensions to those who have been disabled for further service in consequence of the wounds they have received. Provision should also be made for the maintenance of the families of those men who have died from the effects of the injuries they received.

Thefts, &c., in Bhastara in the Hooghly district.

SANJIVANI.

KASIPUR NIVASI,
First fortnight of
the month of
Jaishtha, 1298 B.E.

27. A correspondent of the *Kasipur Nivási*, of the first fortnight of the month of Jaishtha, writing from Sahaspur within the jurisdiction of the Mehedigunge thana in the district of Barisal, says that theft has of late become

very rife within that thana, and the police is indifferent in the matter. On the 7th Jaishtha last a daring dacoity was committed in the house of Rukmini Kant Misra of Kaniboga. Will the Magistrate look to the matter ?

(b)—Working of the courts.

AHMADI,
May 28th, 1891.

28. The *Ahmadi*, of the 28th May, regrets that no Mahomedan Magistrates have hitherto been appointed to the Independent Bench of Tangail in the Mymensingh district, although the place contains a large number of respectable and educated Mahomedans. The local authorities are requested to consider the claims of Mahomedans to be appointed to the Independent Bench.

29. The *Hitavádí*, of the 30th May, thus comments on a case recently decided by Mr. Justice Mahmud, of the Allahabad High Court, in which a Hindu girl was sentenced to imprisonment for refusal to live with her husband:—

Mr. Justice Mahmud bases his decision on two slokas of Manu, neither of which, however, supports his decision. One of these slokas (sloka 89, Chapter 9 of Manusanhita), when translated means : “ If a woman leaves the house (of her husband) in anger on account of her husband’s taking another wife, she should be either detained forthwith or made over to her relatives.”

This sloka is found in the 9th Chapter of Manu, which expressly deals with the respective duties of husband and wife. And according to both *Medhatithi* and *Kulluka*, two of the most celebrated commentators of Manu, it is the husband and not the sovereign who should detain the angry wife, and her detention should last as long as her anger. In the other sloka, women are directed to be fined for certain offences, and the commentator, Medhatithi, says that even the fine should be inflicted by the husband and not by the sovereign. It is clear from this that Mr. Justice Mahmud’s decision is opposed both to the letter and to the spirit of the Hindu law. The learned Judge has quoted another sloka from Manu (317, Chapter 8) which he interprets as meaning that women who, out of pride generated by high descent or the possession of personal charms, &c., refuse to cohabit with their husbands should be made to be eaten up by dogs in a crowded public place, and from which he makes this inference that if women refusing to live with their husbands were so severely dealt with in ancient times, surely they can be sent to jail now for the same offence. Now, the expression in the sloka which, according to Mr. Justice Mahmud, means a woman refusing to cohabit with her husband is ‘*ভর্তৃং লজ্জং যাত্রী*’ which, according to the commentators, means “ a woman who is guilty of adultery.” That this is the true meaning of the expression is clear from this that if it be taken in Mr. Justice Mahmud’s sense, then there will be left in Manu’s Code no provision for punishing adultery in a woman, an offence which was regarded by that law-giver as a very grave offence. It is therefore clear that Mr. Justice Mahmud’s decision is unsound. However disreputable a woman who refuses to live with her husband may be in the eye of Hindu society, she cannot, under the law, be punished by the king for her offence. Mr. Justice

HITAVADI,
May 30th, 1891.

A bad decision of the Allahabad High Court.

Mahmud's decision will not therefore meet with the approval of any Hindu, liberal or conservative. Cases of this kind should be left to be dealt with by Hindu society, which is always ready to exercise its rights in such matters. No Hindu, whether opposed to social reform or not, will consider it good or proper that respectable Hindu girls should go to jail for refusing to live with their husbands.

30. The *Dacca Gazette*, of the 1st June, says that the people of Munshigunge, in the Dacca district, are very much dissatisfied with their Munsif, Babu Chandi Charan Sen. The zemindars of the place, in particular, have been frightened by the Munsif's conduct. Babu Chandi Charan holds that the ryot is entitled to the ownership of all trees, &c., standing on a holding. The Tenancy Act clearly says that this right should belong to the ryot or to the zemindar according to local custom; and custom throughout this part of the country gives the right to the zemindar. A common-sense view of the matter also will give the right to the zemindar; for if this right is allowed to the ryot, he may, when leaving his holding, cut down all trees, &c., and otherwise cause damage to it. Babu Chandi Charan's view of the matter has given perfect immunity to the ryots who are cutting down trees, &c., without fear of being rendered liable for their action. The zemindars do not venture to institute suits against the ryots, as they have little chance of winning them so long as Babu Chandi Charan is their judge.

DACCA GAZETTE,
June 1st, 1891.

31. The *Som Prakash*, of the 1st June, refers to the acquittal of the Sannyasis in the Tarakeswara riot case, and observes as follows:—
By doing strict justice in this case, Babu Gopal Chunder, Deputy Magistrate of Serampore, has earned everybody's respect and admiration. The writer knows Gopal Babu to be a learned, independent and conscientious judicial officer, and considering the way in which he has been administering justice, he will in time become an ornament of the Subordinate Executive Service like Babu Bankim Chunder and others.

SOM PRAKASH,
June 1st, 1891.

(d)—Education.

32. The *Dacca Gazette*, of the 1st June, condemns the Calcutta University for its neglect of the Bengali language, and says that it is owing to this neglect that educated Bengalis consider it beneath their dignity to study their mother-tongue. It is therefore gratifying to find that some interest is being taken in the matter by Dr. Gurudas Bannerji and Babu Asutosh Mukherji.

DACCA GAZETTE,
June 1st, 1891.

33. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 1st June, takes the Government of India to task for not having yet conferred the honour of a Fellowship of the Calcutta University on Rai Ramsunker Sen Bahadur. Rai Ramsunker served Government with exceptional ability in the Subordinate Executive Service, and is possessed of superior attainments. There is no doubt that the University will honour itself by honouring the Rai Bahadur. It is strange that even the present Vice-Chancellor has overlooked Rai Ramsunker.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
June 1st, 1891.

34. The same paper, of the 2nd June, says that the Hindu religious observance of *Shivaratri* will fall on one of the days fixed for the next F. A. and B. A. Examinations. The same difficulty occurred at the last examinations, and their dates had to be altered. Probably a similar course will be followed this time too. But has not the Calcutta University a copy of an almanac? The dates ought to be carefully fixed.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
June 2nd, 1891.

(e)—Local Self-Government and Municipal Administration.

35. The *Burdwan Sanjivani*, of the 26th May, is glad to learn that Government has heard the representations of the people in connection with the administration of cattle-pounds in the district of Burdwan, and is anxious to put down the oppressions which are committed by the ijardars of those pounds. But these oppressions will not be put down if the present practice of leasing out pounds is not

BURDWAN SANJIVAN
May 26th, 1891.

abolished. But the abolition of that practice will reduce the income of Government from this source, and so Government must be prepared to sacrifice a portion of its revenue if it is really anxious to improve pound administration. And if it cannot do that, it should entrust the District Board of Burdwan with larger powers in order to enable it to put a stop to the oppressions. The Board should erect cattle-sheds within the pounds and take rent from the ijardars for the use of those sheds, and thus recover the money which they will spend on their construction. But, as remarked above, it will be much better to abolish the *ijará* system altogether, and to bring the pounds under the khas administration of the District Boards.

BURDWAN SANJIVANI,
May 26th, 1891.

36. A correspondent of the same paper says that the cattle-pound at Rayna, in the district of Burdwan, is in an extremely miserable condition. The cattle in the pound are exposed to all the inclemencies of the weather. The District Board of Burdwan should look to the matter.

SAMAYA,
May 29th, 1891.

37. The *Samaya*, of the 29th May, says that, under orders from the local municipality, the Brahmin who reads the cremation service at the burning ghât of Sanagar near Kalighât exacts his fee of five annas and three pies for each dead body, even when the relatives of the dead bring their own Brahmin with them and do not require him to read the cremation service. At the burning ghât at Nimtola in Calcutta, the friends of the dead often bring their own Brahmin with them to read the cremation service, and are therefore charged no fee by the Brahmin attached to the ghât. The Municipality of Sanagar should therefore abolish the rule empowering the Brahmin attached to the burning ghât to levy a fee from all persons who come to burn dead bodies, or to exempt from its operation those who bring Brahmins of their own to perform the death service.

SANJIVANI,
May 30th, 1891.

38. The *Sanjivani*, of the 30th May, complains of the delapidated condition of the roads in town Kumarkhali in the Nuddea district, and also of their unsatisfactory lighting.

DACCA PRAKASH,
May 31st, 1891.

39. The *Dacca Prakash*, of the 31st May, publishes a statement showing the income and expenditure of the Dacca District Board for the three years 1889-90, 1890-91, and 1891-92, and observes as follows:—

It appears from the statement that the people of the district of Dacca contribute annually Rs. 73,500 for the construction of roads, and Rs. 73,769 for the excavation of tanks, &c. But unfortunately they derive very little benefit from their large contribution. The Board does not spend a single pice on technical education—on the education, that is, which should enable a man to obtain his livelihood. There is not a single technical or agricultural school in the district. The education which is being given to the sons of artisans and agriculturists makes them unfit for the industries of their respective castes, and so they contract habits of luxury and then hanker after clerkships. Girls are being made to read only a few pages of books which teach them the manners of English ladies, and yet so large a sum as Rs. 2,500 is spent on this worthless object. All this is owing to a faulty selection of members for the District Board.

DACCA PRAKASH.

40. The same paper says that by causing the water-pipes to be removed from the neighbourhood of Chundra Mohun Babu's house and thereby satisfying his private grudge, Khanje Mohamed Ajar, the present Chairman of the Dacca Municipality, has lost the confidence of the public. He has demanded large securities from some of the servants of the municipality, who will be unable to find the securities and must resign. The Secretary to the Municipality has been required to furnish Rs. 8,000. The Chairman says that as the Secretary has at times from Rs. 12 to 13,000 in his keeping, he must furnish a security to the extent of Rs. 8,000. But the Collectors of districts often have in their custody 50 to 60 lakhs of rupees, and Government does not demand securities from them.

(g)—*Railways and communications, including canals and irrigation.*

41. The *Uluberia Darpan*, of the 28th May, says that the closing of the road along the bank of the Banskati khal in the

ULUBERIA DARPAN,
May 28th, 1891.

A road in the Uluberia sub-division, in the Howrah district.

Uluberia sub-division by order of the Executive Engineer of the Cossye division has resulted in great inconvenience to the public. People coming to Uluberia from the distant mofussil with the object of embarking there for Calcutta are annoyed to find the ordinary road leading to that place closed, and are compelled to make a long detour and sometimes fail to catch the steamer bound for Calcutta. The public have a prescriptive right to use the road, and the engineers ought not to have closed it. Last year the road was repaired by the local zemindar, and in previous years it was repaired with road cess money. The Local Deputy Magistrate should look to the matter.

42. A correspondent of the *Samaya*, of the 29th May, says that it has been

SAMAYA,
May 29th, 1891.

A road from the Gulsi station to the Grand Trunk road in the District of Burdwan.

proposed to connect the Grand Trunk road passing through the villages of Gulsi and Guli, in the district of Burdwan, with the railway at Gulsi by means of a straight road. But instead of constructing a new road, why not repair the Ferry Fund road from Gulsi to the Railway station *via* Bubla, which will serve the purpose of a new road as well and will prove even more useful than it? The members of the District Board of Burdwan should look to the matter.

43. The *Bangavasi*, of the 29th May, says that the passengers on the

BANGAVASI,
May 29th, 1891.

The Dhakuria station on the Southern Section of the Eastern Bengal State Railway.

Southern Section of the Eastern Bengal State Railway are greatly inconvenienced at the Dhakuria station on that line, because there is no waiting-room, no privy, and no adequate supply of good drinking water there. The municipal authorities of the place should look to the condition of the road leading to the railway premises which, being very narrow and crowded with carriages at train time, becomes dangerous to those who walk to the station.

44. A correspondent of the *Gramvasi*, of the 1st June, says that the road

GRAMVASI,
June 1st, 1891.

A road in the Uluberia sub-division of the Howrah district.

from the hat at Shampur-Nakunna to that at Khujuberia in the Uluberia sub-division of the district of Howrah stands in urgent need of repair. The road in question is crossed by many khals, ditches, and water-courses, and people are put to great difficulty in crossing them. Two hats are held at Khujuberia every week. It is a great trading centre, and is daily frequented by large numbers of people. The road leading to it should therefore be kept in a state of repair. The District Board is asked to look to the matter.

(h)—*General.*

45. The *Saraswat Patra*, of the 23rd May, says that though it is the duty

SARASWAT PATRA,
May 23rd, 1891.

The Poverty Commission.

of Government to remove the poverty of all its Indian subjects, still the writer is exceedingly glad to learn that it has directed its attention to the question of the poverty of at least one class of its subjects, the Eurasians.

Lord Wenlock's answer to the representation made to him by the Madras Eurasians, though it may sound harsh in their ears, has pleased everybody else. But the uprightness shown by the Madras Government in its reply to the Eurasian representation is not less pleasing than the efforts which the Bengal Government is making to remove the poverty of the Eurasians. The one Government aims at doing good to its subjects and the other at doing good in an impartial spirit.

The question now arises, why are the Eurasians so poor? The question is not difficult to answer.

The income of an Eurasian is not much larger than the income of an average native, but his style of living is thoroughly European. And this is enough to explain why the Eurasians as a class are poor. But the natives do not fare better in this respect. What with their old social customs and what with the luxury of modern civilisation, the natives too can hardly make the two ends meet with their poor incomes. Indeed, considering the critical position in which the native, with two modes of living to comply with, finds himself, the position of the Eurasian with his single style of living seems to him almost enviable.

It is hoped that the Government, whilst attempting to alleviate the distressed condition of the Eurasian community, will not prove unkind to its native subjects, and will not tarnish its reputation for impartiality by showing special favour to one class of its subjects.

SAMAYA,
May 29th, 1891.

46. The *Samaya*, of the 29th May, has read the Benares riot resolution with astonishment and regret. Sir Auckland Colvin's order for closing the temple of Ramji against the public is very objectionable. It may induce Hindus and Mussulmans to behave peacefully for some time. But who shall say that the fire which will smoulder in their hearts in consequence of the order will not blaze out fearfully in the course of time? It is the duty of Government to observe its promise and preserve the dignity of the Queen's Proclamation. The writer is not prepared to say that the exclusion of the public from the right of worshipping in the temple is not an act of interference with the Hindu religion. It is hoped that the Governor-General will give the matter his anxious consideration.

The Benares riot resolution.

BANGAVASI,
May 30th, 1891.

47. The *Bangavasi*, of the 30th May, censures the Government of the North-Western Provinces for publishing its resolution on the Benares riot, while the case of the rioters is still *sub judice*. The writer also says that the resolution is very unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it has tried to please both parties. The temple will not be demolished, but until the completion of the water-works no one, except the priest, will be allowed to enter it. This is highly objectionable, and it is not clear under what authority Government thus refuses the public admission to a public place of worship. The decision of Government to maintain the temple within the water-works compound is no less objectionable; for it is not proper that a Hindu temple should exist within an enclosure which will be frequented by Mussalmans and others. As the authorities appear to be anxious to please the Hindus, they ought to have left them at perfect liberty to use the temple as they liked.

The Benares riot resolution.

DACCA PRAKASH,
May 31st, 1891.

48. The *Dacca Prakash*, of the 31st May, refers to the Government resolution on the Benares riot, and says that, by closing the temple of Ramji temporarily against the public, Government has given proof of indiscretion, inexperience, and shortsightedness.

The Benares riot resolution.

SOM PROKASH,
June 1st, 1891.

49. The *Som Prakash*, of the 1st June, says that the Government Resolution on the Benares riot has taken it by surprise. If the public are to be excluded from the temple of Ramji, the writer does not see that the Hindus have gained any advantage. The public ought not to suffer for the faults of a few rioters.

The Benares riot resolution.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
June 3rd, 1891.

50. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 3rd June, says that oppression by Mr. Sandel, Comptroller of Postal Accounts, has become unbearable to his native subordinates. A young European Assistant in his office having lost an office paper, Mr. Sandel attached the salaries of 200 native clerks.

Mr. Sandel of the Post Office.

KASIPUR NIVASI,
First fortnight of
the month of
Jaishtha, 1298 B.E.

51. The *Kasipur Nivasi*, of the first fortnight of the month of Jaishtha, says that the letter-box kept in a shop near the office of this paper in the town of Barisal is opened only once at 2 P.M. every day. And as in the town post office the Dacca mail is closed in the afternoon, the local mail in the evening, and the Calcutta mail after nightfall, the letters put in the above letter-box remain there for 24 hours before they are taken out for despatch. The post office is situated at a distance of about a quarter of a mile from the office of this paper, and so it is very desirable for the convenience of the public that the box should be opened twice, viz. at 2 P.M. and in the evening.

A postal complaint in the town of Barisal.

III.—LEGISLATIVE.

PRATIKAR,
May 8th, 1891.

52. The *Pratikar*, of the 8th May, says that Lord Lansdowne appears at last to have realised what the evil effects of the Consent Act are likely to be. All necessity for the Consent Act circular would have been obviated if his Lordship had listened to the wailings of the people during the agitation. The circular is a great favour to the people.

The Consent Act Circular.

URDU GUIDE AND
DARUSSALTANAT,
May 29th, 1891.

53. The *Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat*, of the 29th May, says that, instead of fixing an age limit for consenting to cohabitation, Government ought to have fixed an age limit for

The Consent Act.

the marriage of girls. That would have been a straightforward course. But the English Government never follows a straightforward policy in legislative matters.

54. The *Navayuga*, of the 25th May, wants to know why the Consent Act, which has now become law for some time, has not yet been published in the Gazette. No sooner a law is passed than it is published in the Gazette, and why has this practice been departed from in the case of the Consent Act? It will be well for the country if the new law is no longer heard of.

NAVAYUGA,
May 25th, 1891.

55. The *Saraswat Patra*, of the 30th May, says that, considering the cruelty which is committed upon domesticated animals by their owners, it is gratifying to learn that the Bengal Government has extended the operation of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act to the whole of the Mymensingh district.

SARAWAT PATRA,
May 30th, 1891.

VI.—MISCELLANEOUS.

56. The *Sahachar*, of the 27th May, says that for some time past a strong religious agitation has been going on in this country, and attempts are being made even at the present moment to bring about the repeal of the Consent Act. The public are being told that Government has interfered with the religion of its subjects, that there is no guarantee that it will not again do so in future, and that both the Benares and Shambazar riots had their origin in the religious fears of the people. Religious agitation in this strain should be given up; for, if persisted in, it will prove dangerous to the civil liberty of the people. They enjoy full religious liberty, but they do not yet enjoy full civil liberty. It is therefore their duty to do nothing which may endanger their civil liberty, and to do everything which may enlarge it. But persistent religious agitations and frequent rioting in the name of religion are sure to compel Government to adopt rigorous and repressive measures, and to proclaim martial law in the country for the safety of the empire. And if that is done, of what use will the agitation to save the temple of Ramji or the musjid at Shambazar be? The statement is not true that Government wants to injure the religions of its subjects. And supposing that the Consent Act has interfered with the Hindu religion, what is the good of further agitating against it? People should rather point out to Government its mistake and try to introduce reforms in the Legislative Councils, which will prevent similar mistakes in the future. They should give up their cant about religion and try to enlarge the sphere of their political liberty. Unlawful gatherings like those in Benares and Calcutta will, in future, be suppressed with the aid of soldiers, and the result will be unnecessary loss of life. No one should therefore allow himself to be deluded into the belief that Government wants to interfere with the religion of its subjects.

SAHACHAR,
May 27th, 1891.

57. The same paper asks that now that Mr. Crawford has been granted a pension, will not Mr. Duke, the late Commissioner of Pegu, who has been dismissed for having taken bribes though his mistress, also get a pension? And following Mrs. Crawford's precedent will not a pension be given to Mr. Duke's mistress too?

SAHACHAR.

58. The *Navayuga*, of the 28th May, has the following in an article headed—"Why does all this happen"?—
"Why does all this happen"? What is the cause of all this? What has made peaceful India so uneasy? Why has the dark cloud risen in the blue sky? What is the cause of this sudden storm which is blowing over India? A dread of something wrong that may happen has taken possession of the public mind. Bad days dawned for India, which has been changed into something new since the passing of the Consent Bill. The disaster in Manipur, the Benares riot, the Tarakesvara riot, and the Shambazar riot have followed each other in quick succession. And the question naturally arises in men's minds, why does all this happen? There was uninterrupted peace in India since the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. During this period of peace no disturbances were heard of and no riots occurred requiring to be put down with the help of the military. And why are disturbances so numerous now? The *Morning Post* newspaper of Allahabad says that a strong feeling of unrest prevails in the

NAVAYUGA,
May 28th, 1891.

country, that the country's peace may be broken every moment, and that sedition is being openly talked in the bazars of Allahabad, Agra, Lucknow, and other places. This statement of an English newspaper as well as the disturbances which are occurring on all sides have really alarmed the writer. One is afraid to think from what trifling cause rose the fearful riot in Calcutta. The writer is led to think that a strange and extraordinary impulse has seized men's minds, and this feeling is bursting forth on small provocation. What is the cause of this unrest? No one need be told that it is due to an apprehension of danger to religion. Reference is then again made to the Shambazar riot, and the following remark is made:—It is the duty of Government to prevent such riots. According to some of the Anglo-Indian editors, these riots should be put down with a strong hand. But the writer is of opinion that kindly treatment will be more effective than the use of force. Those writers, again, who say that the people of India have not yet learnt what religious toleration is should read history. It need not be told that any attempt that may be made by Englishmen to teach the people of India religious toleration by force will prove abortive. All the discontent which is now prevailing in the country, and of which the recent disturbances are mere symptoms or indications, is due to the passing of the Consent Bill. If, therefore, Government has the good of the people at heart, it should repeal the new law and bring back peace into the country.

BANGANIVASI,
May 29th, 1891.

59. The *Banganivási*, of the 29th May, says that it is idle to expect that the Indian industries will ever receive encouragement at the hands of the Government, whose sole

Indian art and industry.

aim is to promote the interests of the English people. It is true some of those industries, as for instance the ebony industry of Monghyr, the brass industry of Benares, and the woollen industry of Delhi and Agra, are receiving patronage at the hands of the English public. But English taste is marring the beauty and destroying the originality of Indian art. For the Indian artist now finds it to his profit to imitate British models rather than follow his own original types.

URDU GUIDE AND
DARUSSALTANAT,
May 29th, 1891.

60. The *Urdu Guide and Darussaltanat*, of the 29th May, says that the Bengali Babu in charge of the Nawab of Oudh's

The Nawab of Oudh's Emam-
barah in Metiaburuj.

Emambarah in Metiaburuj lately objected to a Shahzadah's dead body being buried within the

Emambarah grounds. Heaven alone knows why the Babu demanded a sum of Rs. 100 from the relatives of the deceased Shahzadah for granting the necessary permission. Permission was, however, got from the Magistrate of Alipore. Ought not the Government to appoint a Mahomedan to the office?

SANJIVANI,
May 30th, 1891.

61. In referring to the celebration of the seventy-third birthday of Her Majesty, the *Sanjivani*, of the 30th May, says that, considering the peace and prosperity the people of

The Queen.

India are enjoying under Her Majestys' rule, there is no doubt that they will unanimously pray for her long life. The people of India can well boast of a Sovereign whose equal in purity of character and in kindness and nobleness of heart, history, past or present, is unable to show. It is the pride and delight of the Indians that they have got for their Sovereign one who is a fond mother, an affectionate wife, and a kind-hearted ruler.

BANGAVASI,
May 30th, 1891.

62. In an article headed "No Need of Brute Force," the *Bangavási*, of the 30th May, says:—The fact that, owing to the

Government and Hinduism.

mistaken action of the British Government, which is

proud of its physical prowess and is possessed of brute force, the Hindus are now alarmed for the safety of their eternal religion is one which recalls to their mind a period of severe affliction and adversity in their past history. We, however, do not share this alarm. We are not so mad as to fear the destruction of that indestructible and eternal religion which we follow and serve. But though we are not troubled by any such fears, still we would not see the British Government making itself unpopular or an object of disrespect and ridicule, and we do not at all want to see the sovereign meddling with our religion. When the sky is overcast with clouds and enveloped in deep gloom, when the rumbling thunder is heard and the rain falls in torrents, no one surely is troubled by the fear that the sun, the light of the world, has been extinguished and has disappeared for ever. And yet no one likes the inky and almost all-pervading mud, the dirt, the dampness, the horrible stench and the chill east

wind which are the concomitants of a rainy day in large cities like Calcutta. And so it is with the evil day ushered in by the Age of Consent Act. There is no fear that that law will subvert our religion, but nobody can still like the wild and ecstatic dance of the monkey-troop, crying out that it is all over with early marriage, or the exultation of the sweeper-community that the path of social reform is at last discovered.

Once before, in the history of the Hindu people, the eternal Hindu religion had to pass through a period of severe trouble and misfortune. Buddhism had triumphed over Hinduism and very nearly succeeded in crushing it out. Buddhist ritual, Buddhist philosophy, Buddhist learning ousted their Brahmanical rivals. The country swarmed with Buddhist monks, nuns, preachers and students. The Brahmanical caste-system became almost a thing of the past. The religious ascendancy of the Buddhists was of the most pronounced and far-reaching kind. The period of Buddhistic supremacy was also a period of commercial enterprise and prosperity. Buddhist preachers and Buddhist merchants were found in the remotest countries of Asia. But in this hour of adversity, when the Hindu religion seemed all but lost and subverted, arose the great Shankar Acharjya, who, with his legion of Sannyasi disciples, at once began his successful crusade against Buddhism, and such was the power and every of his attack that it swept Buddhism off the land with all its institutions. Hinduism was re-established in India. But the mighty work was not accomplished by Shankar with the aid of sword or bayonet. There was no oppression, bloodshed or use of brute force. The eternal Hindu religion has no need of such accessories. Brute force can protect it no more than it can alter or subvert it. Brute force proved powerless even for the religious conversion of the boy Prahlad. And the Mighty and Merciful Being who protected Prahlad from the oppressions to which he was subjected by his father will yet surely protect the religion of the Hindus if Hindus only earnestly and devoutly pray to Him for help and protection in this hour of their sore affliction.

English rulers! we say to you, do not even indulge in the boast that you can by brute force effect the corruption of the eternal Hindu religion, nor need you fear that for the purpose of protecting that religion your subjects will resort to brute force. But this we must plainly say that if by interfering with the religion of your Indian subjects you wound them in the tenderest part of their heart, your good fortune will not probably attend you long. Just think over the incidents of the last two months. A municipality had before this demolished a temple at Durbhunga, but there was no riot or affray worth speaking of on that account. But in an evil moment and under the influence of an evil star, you gave out, with a frowning brow and in a spirit of defiance, that you consider it your duty to oppose your subject's religion whenever it pleases you to do so. And see what occurred after this in connection with the attempt to demolish a temple at Benares!

Think also of the affair at Calcutta. Suresh Baboo had claimed the right to demolish the masjid and obtained a decree in his favour; but far from applying for execution of the decree he did not even take a copy thereof. There was nothing the matter here, but news of the Benares riots began gradually to reach the ignorant Mahomedan population of Calcutta, and referring to Suresh Baboo's claim they exclaimed—"Keyá! Hindu log, oská mandir ko oyásté Káshijimé larái kiyá hyái, a'or hám log Khodá ki masjid ésái torné déngé, kadi néhi hogá. Hám log Islámké oyáste ján déngé."—"What! the Hindus have fought at Benares for the sake of their temple, and shall we let God's masjid to be demolished in this way? Never! We shall lay down our lives for the sake of Islam." No sooner said than done. Mussulmans came in crowds to lay down their lives. And lay down their lives they did.

A few loyal newspaper editors are saying in a blustering fashion that the man must be very dull and silly who should describe the Shambazar riot as a political occurrence. We say that it is these hypocrites who would thus throw dust into the eyes of Government that are really disloyal to it. For truth must triumph.

India under British rule is not a plaything in the hands of a child, that any body may snatch it away by frightening it. No one now is so silly as to indulge in any such hope or expectation. It is also true that the Hindu will not use brute

force in the protection of his religion. But the present attitude of the ignorant Mussulmans who have heard and believed the rumour, no matter whether well-founded or not, that Government is about to destroy the religion of its subjects, is something in regard to which our silence is not likely to do us any good either in this world or in the next. It is true we understand that the snake-charmer is simply frightening us by playing with his snake of the Consent Act in our presence, that he has himself extracted the poison-fangs of the snake, because he is himself afraid of losing his life, and knows well that not unoften the snake-charmer is himself bitten by the snake he exhibits and plays with. We know and understand all this, but all people do not. As soon as they have heard that the snake-charmer has let his snake out of its basket, men have come out with clubs and bludgeons. And would it be proper to suppress this fact? Would it not, on the contrary, be proper and desirable that the snake-charmer should be summoned, and told that, no matter whether or not his snake still possessed its fangs, people did not want to see it, that the mere sight of a hooded snake was enough to make them believe that it was a poisonous snake, and that he need not any more play with it or set it upon others? Would it not be proper and desirable that he should be told to confine the snake in his basket, so that men's fear might be removed and their minds made easy? What if the *gundás*, who came out armed with clubs and bludgeons to kill the snake, should, after killing it or being unable to kill it, belabour the snake-charmer himself with those weapons? How serious a matter would that be! Therefore do we say—Snake-charmer! recall and take care of your snake, and the *gundás* will return to their homes with their clubs and bludgeons; and we, quiet and inoffensive people as we are, shall be able to engage ourselves in the undisturbed contemplation of God.

In another article headed "Englishmen! will you listen to us?" the same paper says:—Englishmen! you are our sovereign, not a petty or a common sovereign, but a sovereign worthy of the name! Your power is unlimited. You have brought under your sway India which is thirty times as large as your own country, and you are ruling this Empire as it were with your nod. Do so, we are not sorry for it. You say now and then that you have become our rulers by conquering India by strength of arms. We do not admit this. We know, and we are supported in our contention by Seeley and other eminent English historians, that you have not conquered this country by strength of arms, that we placed it, as it were, in your hands of our own free will. We therefore expect you to rule this country with justice and in a spirit of sympathy with the people. We do not, of course, say that you do not mind your duty or that you disregard the grievances of your subjects. But it is a fact that, from time to time, through inadvertence or owing to our bad luck, you commit serious blunders, and those blunders cause us much suffering. We expect much from you, and so if our expectations are blasted, we are wounded in our heart and we come forward to tell you our grievances. But the treatment we then receive at your hands is such that instead of feeling our grievances removed we often feel them aggravated. If the truth must be told, my masters, know it for certain that you will not find in any other part of the world such loyal subjects as the people of India. Loyalty is, as it were, imbedded in our bone and marrow; we do not require to learn loyalty. The practice and education of ages has made loyalty one of our instinctive and hereditary virtues. No other religion in the world teaches loyalty so fully and effectively as the Hindu religion, which is based upon the canons of morality laid down in the *Sastras*. Take the following as illustrations:—You are rulers in your own country, and yet the subjects there are not contented. In how many different ways are they rising in rebellion. There is "socialism" in America, not to speak of the countries of Europe. There the life of the sovereign is not safe. "Nihilism," "Anarchism," and many other political troubles and disturbances are occurring in those countries. And will you still say, my masters, that we are not loyal? Why do the people of this country, with their divers castes, divers languages, divers religions, divers customs and divers points of difference, love you so much? Do you ever think of this? Even the one great man among you that ever thought over this matter did not venture to call us disloyal. What he said was that we are loyal, but our loyalty is based upon considerations of self-interest. There

is no harm even in our admitting this. Our weal and woe depend upon your weal and woe. It will be only too well for us if you can rule happily and if your power remains unimpaired. But, Englishmen, you know everything, there is no place in the world that you have not seen. Now, lay your hands upon your hearts and say whether you shall find anywhere else such subjects as these? We cannot of course say that there are many good rulers like you. But if we must praise rulers like you, you on your part cannot but praise subjects like ourselves. There is at the present moment extreme scarcity of food in the country, deaths from starvation are frequent, and they are not many that can afford themselves the luxury of a full meal. There are besides these fearful famines occurring at intervals and these deadly epidemics and other visitations devastating the country. It is not we alone that say this. Thoughtful Englishmen are gradually coming to understand this. As for ourselves we see it before our eyes. And do your subjects still blame or complain against you? No, many of them do not even know why all this is taking place. They only blame their fate and console themselves with the thought that their sufferings in this life are the result of sins committed by them in previous births, and they are taking care not to commit sin in this life, so that they may not be subjected to similar sufferings in their next birth. It is only those who possess a little sense that cry to you for relief. What is your opinion of your duty as regards the work of administering this Empire? It is because on many occasions you cannot form a clear conception of your duty in this respect that we are subjected to so much hardship and inconvenience. But are not you, too, subjected to hardship and inconvenience on our account? But, English rulers, dull-witted as we are, we do not understand why this should be so.

All of a sudden you have passed the Consent Bill into law. Very well, we will say nothing to it, nor shall we discuss the question whether the Act is good or bad. The question is, what have you gained by passing it? Here there was no question of raising revenue for the purpose of strengthening the frontiers in view of a probable Russian invasion of India, or for the purpose of conducting the work of administration. Why, then, did you, Englishman, hurl this fatal javelin at the breasts of the 'Indians? You have gained nothing, but you have wounded the feelings of crores of the Indian population. What policy is this of yours? We cannot understand it. Did you then enact this law for the purpose of sowing dissension among the Indians? You have said all along that the Congressists represent nobody. Why did you, then, on the representation of a handful of outcastes among them, hurl that thunderbolt in disregard of the united cries of so many people and of the real leaders of the native community? Is this wisely done of you? You have accepted the statements which have been made by men who are apostates from their religion, by non-Hindus and by low caste men, and you have disregarded the representations of learned, devout and influential Hindus! Truly, my masters, we have not for a long time witnessed an act of such indiscretion on your part.

We are agitated by fear, we are almost dead with disgrace and humiliation, and we are in a state of perpetual alarm. Still do we say—recall this dart of a law, and act according to the belief and conviction of the majority of the Indian people. If those whom you would benefit do not appreciate your philanthropy, why do you persist in your efforts? The proper time has not yet come; let this Kali Yuga develop still further its characteristic features, let the world become one dead level of uniformity, let the high become low, and the low become high, let religion's hold become weaker, and you will find your wish fulfilled, as a matter of course, and there will be no necessity on your part of enacting any law and earning a bad name by so doing. We do not wish to slander you. We have through your favour learnt English, and we are constantly reading the condemnation which is passed by thoughtful English writers upon your manners and customs. We do not much mind all that; nor are we elated with pride at the encomiums passed by them on our own social manners and practices. We only say this—Do good, do good by convincing others that you are doing good, or the nectar will be converted into poison. It is for this that we have said so much. Do not be angry. Even if you do not believe in our spontaneous and instinctive loyalty, you will doubtless be prepared to place some faith in our interested loyalty. No elaborate argument is required to convince you that there is nothing like self-interest.

My masters, we have now nothing left except the treasure of our religion. Do not, on any account, lay your hands upon it either directly or indirectly. Whether we have food or starve, we do not blame you. If we die we do not complain, we only blame our fate and do not even try to think or understand why it should be so. Do not therefore lay your hands upon our religion. This is our respectful prayer. We shall now endeavour to explain certain minor matters to you. Formerly there were many Christian missionaries in this country, but people did not then talk of the Christians so much as they do now. That state of things has passed away. The missionaries are now more anxious than ever to convert natives to Christianity. Different sorts of missionaries are coming to this country in crowds, and they have succeeded in converting some common people; nor are Christian women sitting idle all the while. These latter have entered into our zenanas and are trying day and night to bring our women to the light. Many poor and starving men are embracing Christianity. They are of course men who occupy a very low position in native society. The missionaries being the countrymen and co-religionists of the English officials demand and obtain pecuniary assistance and moral support from Government. But with all their efforts they will be never able to do any injury to the eternal Hindu religion, and if it is true that the world is moving forward in the direction of progress, and not backward on the path of decline, we cherish the expectation that all other nations will, in the end, come to adopt the customs and observances of the Hindus. Signs of this are already visible. Of course, it will be sometime before the mlechchha world comes to adopt the pure manners and institutions of the Hindus; but, however delayed the event may be, it will, when it occurs, form the last chapter in the history of the world's civilisation. As regards the Christian missionaries, we will only say that their immorality and recklessness is daily increasing. There is no harm in their preaching their religion in streets and other public places, and we do not object to it. But why do they go to places of pilgrimage frequented by countless Hindus and there try to provoke breaches of the peace by vilifying the religion of the natives? The religious devotion of the people of this country is something maddening, but being a quiet and inoffensive people, they do not commit any excesses. Gradually, however, under the influence of English education, this state of things will pass away. Under these circumstances, it is not proper to allow Christian missionaries to visit such places of pilgrimage, and vilify Hindu gods and goddesses. This it was which brought about the recent riot at Tarakeswar, and there may be similar riots in future. Precautionary measures should be therefore adopted at once in this connection. That we are saying this is not because we shall be unable to protect our own religion, but because the matter may lead to evil consequences in future. And if the future brings on evil consequences, you, Englishmen, will then call us enemies of the empire and persecute us, and real injury will be done to the country! It is this fear that makes us say all this. Then consider what occurred in Benares. What if you did not save the lives of the inhabitants of that city by giving them a supply of pure water? They were not really all of them dying for want of water; and if you really could not enjoy peace of mind except by giving them a drink of filtered water, if you were really beside yourselves at the painful thought that the wretches were drinking impure water (though the sight of people dying of starvation is not found to move you much), was it not possible to arrange for a filtered water-supply without demolishing a Hindu temple? Why is a seriously wrong act permitted to be done under your rule for the sake of doing a good act? Why are orders passed for demolishing a temple for the sake of obtaining filtered water? And why under those orders are the steps of a temple demolished? And after committing this grossly wrong act and driving people mad, is it proper in the end to punish them cruelly? Surely, the men of Benares would not have gone so far if they had not been exasperated into going thus far. Who is more to blame in this matter—we who exasperated, or he who being unable to control himself became exasperated?

See, again, what has occurred in Manipur. Hang the Senapati, and we will say nothing to that. Inflict condign punishment upon the Jubaraj and others who took up arms against the English, and we will say nothing to that. But would it be well if the servants of a powerful Government like yours should be guilty of massacring women and children? We will put up even with that,

but why have the gods of the Manipuris been blown off by means of dynamite? What fault did the gods commit? Not the Manipuris only, but the whole country feels astounded and wounded in its heart of hearts for this act of yours. Fear, of course, prevents us from saying how we feel. Englishmen! this act will not bring you fame, and what will you gain by it? You dissatisfy all your subjects. What policy is this? Rulers! know it for certain that just as there are great and godlike men among you, so there are also among you many who are no better than ferocious beasts. If you do not hold your beasts in check, how will the welfare of the empire be promoted? My masters, think not that we have said all this in anger or in spite. It is only with deep sorrow and with a view to draw your attention to the means by which any future danger to the empire may be averted that we make these remarks. And our prayer to you is, adopt measures to avert that evil and that danger.

63. The same paper says that the *Englishman* misses no opportunity of fomenting quarrels between Hindus and Mussulmans. It has taken advantage of the Sham-bazar riot to widen the breach between the two peoples by saying that the riot was the outcome of the partiality shown to the Hindu suitor by the Hindu Judge. All sensible Hindus and Mussulmans will no doubt see the *Englishman's* motive for making such a statement; and both Hindus and Mussulmans should know that the *Englishman* is their inveterate enemy.

64. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 31st May, says that the more carefully the administrative policy of the English in India is examined, the more hollow and unsubstantial does that policy appear to be. The English administration possesses great external splendour, and a superficial observer is apt to be misled into the idea that India is making great progress under the English rule. Railway trains are running from one end of the country to the other, news is being wired in a moment to far off places, the rivers are full of merchantmen which transport goods to foreign ports and the country is studded with factories, machines, places of business, &c. And who that sees all this shall say that the people of India are poor? But let this external veil of splendour be removed, and the real misery of the country will stand revealed. The signs of progress which are seen in the country are signs of English progress and prosperity; not signs of the progress and prosperity of the people of the country whose condition is daily deteriorating. Englishmen often profess to do things for the material welfare of the people of India, but those things really fill the pockets of their own countrymen. Look, for instance, at the irrigation work of Government, and see how the money spent on the construction and maintenance of canals is being wasted. Canals are often constructed in parts of the country which are well supplied with water, and the money spent in these excavations is simply wasted and goes to fill the pockets of European engineers, contractors, &c. In his evidence before the Finance Committee, Sir Arthur Cotton, the celebrated Madras Engineer, said:—

"The Ganges canal was falsely projected. It cost £ 3,000,000, because they chose to go up into the hills to fetch the water at a level where they did not want it, and it cost them £ 1,000,000 to bring them into the plain, whereas if they had brought it from below the hills, they could have brought it for £ 1,000,000."

The statement speaks for itself. It is thus that India's money is wasted. Similarly people have to pay 11 lacs of rupees as interest on the capital spent on the excavation of the Sone Canal, while the income from the canal amounts only to five lacs per annum. Will any one still say that English administration is doing nothing but good to India?

The railways are also doing much mischief to the country. They have, indeed, made communication easy, but they are at the same time impoverishing the country. Railways are made by English Companies, and Government stipulates to pay interest on the capital which they invest in the work. They have invested some 100 crores of rupees, and Government has to pay five crores of rupees as interest on that sum. The outflow of this large sum of money from the country cannot but impoverish it. As the things required for constructing railways have to be brought from England, 50 crores out of the 100 which the English Companies invested, have found their way back into England, and

BANGAVASI,
May 30th, 1891.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
May 31st, 1891.

only 50 crores have been spent on this country. But the interest which Government has up to this time had to pay on the capital invested in the railways amounts to 57 crores of rupees. Thus, instead of being enriched by the investment of foreign capital in this country, as is asserted by Sir John Strachey, the people of India have been impoverished to the extent of seven crores on account of railways. Englishmen say that the internal trade of the country has been improved by the railways, but as a matter of fact they have served only to reduce the food-supply of the country.

There were no railways in the country in 1854. During the 50 years from 1802 to 1852, there were only thirteen famines in the country, and mortality from them amounted to 50 lacs. But since the construction of railways, there have been sixteen famines in the country within 19 years from 1860 to 1879, and the mortality therefrom has amounted to $1\frac{1}{2}$ crores. And yet it is said that many railways were constructed for the express purpose of preventing famine. These railways have, by facilitating the exportation of goods, done much good to the English, but are, by reducing the food-supply of the country, increasing the poverty and miseries of the people. And Englishmen would still have the Indians and the world believe that under their rule India is enjoying unbounded felicity!

HINDI BANGAVASI,
June 1st, 1891.

65. The *Hindi Bangavási*, of the 1st June, says that the Mahomedans of Calcutta are raising subscriptions for conducting the defence of their co-religionists who were implicated in the late Shambazar riot. Would Government have allowed the people of Benares to adopt a similar course for conducting the defence of the Benares rioters? It would certainly have come down upon them if they had done so.

The Shambazar and the Benares riots.

RAISUL AKHBARI
MURSHIDABAD,
June 1st, 1891.

66. The *Raisul Akhbari Murshidabad*, of the 1st June, says that the Government of India ought to give some reply without further delay to the representation of the Mahomedans of Rangoon on the subject of the demolition of their burial-ground. Delay or hesitation in such matters is calculated to cause great excitement.

The Rangoon burial-ground question.

RAISUL AKHBARI
MURSHIDABAD.

67. The same paper is at a loss to understand whether the Shambazar riot was brought about through some flaw in the law about possession, or through some error in the judgment passed in the suit brought by the purchaser of the *musjid* land, or through some fault of the police. The police ought certainly to be blamed for having joined in the fighting that took place. Its onesidedness in this affair is perhaps due to Suresh Babu's having many friends in the police service. The Mahomedans themselves can hardly be blamed for their conduct seeing that their religion was at stake. The writer cannot but find fault with the judgment passed by the Alipore Court, for no Court of law has the power to order the demolition of a *musjid*.

The Shambazar riot.

Sir Charles Elliott should be thanked for his proposal to purchase the land and make it over free of cost to the Mahomedans. The proposed action of the Bengal Government shows that it is only too anxious to please its subjects. The subordinate officials of Government ought to note this.

Seeing how the municipalities are now-a-days wounding the religious feelings of the people throughout the country, it behoves the Government to pass a new law protecting the religions of the people.

DAINIK-O-SAMACHAR
CHANDRIKA,
June 4th, 1891.

68. The *Dainik-o-Samachar Chandrika*, of the 4th June, has the following on the charge of disloyalty brought against it in the *Indian Daily News*:—

What is true loyalty?

The old Editor of the *Indian Daily News* has been wont of late to give ready credence to all that is alleged against the *Bangavási* or the *Dainik*, and so reckless has he become that he often attributes the utterances of the *Bangavási* to the *Dainik*, and *vice versa*. An anonymous correspondent of that paper has recently drawn the attention of Government to the writings of the *Dainik* regarding Manipur affairs. What we are concerned with here, however, is neither the conduct of the Editor of the *Indian Daily News*, nor that of its anonymous correspondent, but the question, who is truly loyal?

Who is truly loyal? Is he to be called loyal who can find no fault in the ruler, or passes over the ruler's faults in silence, and thereby encourages him in wrong-doing? If this be loyalty, then may the good God keep us far from

such loyalty! He is not a good minister who does not give wholesome counsel to his Sovereign, and does not prevent his Sovereign from doing wrong. As bitter drugs are needed for the cure of the ailments of the body, so are bitter counsels needed for the cure of the ailments of the mind. And he is not a physician but Pluto incarnate who, instead of giving bitter drugs to his patient, gives him only sweetmeats to eat. Every newspaper editor is an honorary minister of the Government, and it is therefore the duty of every newspaper editor to tell Government what its faults are.

We consider the entire British people to be the rulers of India, and we look upon the Viceroy, the Commander-in-Chief, and the lower officers as so many representatives of the British people. The Queen of England we regard as one who is the object of worship of both the English and the Indian people. The welfare of the British Queen and the British Government is indissolubly bound up with that of the British people, and the welfare of India is also bound up with the welfare of that people. It was from an impression that the Manipur policy of Government was fraught with injury to the English people that we warned the English officers and the chief among them, the Viceroy, in particular. It is we who first condemned Mr. Quinton for the Manipur disaster, and every English paper is now condemning both him and Lord Lansdowne for that disaster, and even the British Parliament is strongly condemning Lord Lansdowne's action in regard to Manipur.

Even if the Viceroy had been the Sovereign of the Indians, we would not have shrunk from pointing out his faults, for it is the duty of a newspaper editor to prevent the Sovereign from wrong-doing. But since the British people are the true rulers of the Indian people, it would be nothing less than faithlessness on our part if we should fail to point out to them the faults of the Government. We are not like Anglo-Indians guided by considerations of self-interest, nor are we like them mere birds of passage with no permanent interest in the country.

The Cabul War, the Sepoy Mutiny, and the Burmese War have injured us far more than they have injured Anglo-Indians, and the present Manipur disaster has done, and will yet do us far more injury than to Anglo-Indians. It is our blood that is shed in these wars. Do not a thousand native soldiers die in these wars for one English soldier that dies in them? Is it not we that have to bear the burden of the debt of Government which was doubled immediately after the Mutiny, and is now quadrupled? The Anglo-Indian Editor of the *Indian Daily News* will soon go to England, and there live upon the money he has earned in India, and so he will have done with India for good. Can there be any comparison between Native and Anglo-Indian Editors?

If loyalty is to be shown to Government, devotion is also to be shown to the country. The loyalty which is not found conjoined with patriotism is a false and treacherous feeling which possesses no value whatever.

No one has been more deeply affected than ourselves by the Manipur disaster. And our object all along in giving the counsels we have given has been to prevent further and greater disaster. The anonymous correspondent of the *Indian Daily News* has neither the head nor the heart to enter into our motives in discussing the question, who is responsible for the Manipur disaster? The only object of the correspondent is to set the Anglo-Indian community and the Anglo-Indian Government against us. None but a coward could have sought the assistance of an Anglo-Indian paper for such a purpose.

The English papers are now warning the Home and Indian Governments in the same words in which we have warned them. If the *Dainik* is, therefore, disloyal, the charge applies equally to the English papers.

We can also claim some credit to ourselves as being a member of that body who have by their criticism made Government moderate its desire for revenge. Did not the officers and soldiers who were sent on the Manipur expedition burn for revenge? Was not Lord Lansdowne himself prompted by extremely revengeful feelings? Was it not at first decided that those who would be convicted by the Manipur court-martial would be forthwith hanged, and has it not been ordered subsequently that no execution should take place without the sanction of the Viceroy? Every impartial man will now see whether we did right or wrong in warning the Government.

Anglo-Indian papers make a distinction between the criticisms of Government measures in the Anglo-Indian press and the criticisms of Government

measures in the native press. They say that the first is innocuous, being written in English and not being read by the people at large, but the other is mischievous, because it is read by the people at large whose loyalty is diminished thereby. Is this distinction made with the view of avoiding a gagging law? We believe that the country is benefited instead of being injured by the pointing out of the faults of Government. The more cautious all officers from the Viceroy downwards become, the better for the country. Those who dislike criticisms of Government measures in the native press are, perhaps, under the impression that the officials must go on doing wrong for ever, and it is therefore desirable that the people at large should not be informed of the wrong actions of which they are guilty. But we know that the officials do wrong from misunderstanding and misconception, and the Viceroy and his Councillors are all liable to fall into error. It is our belief that severe criticisms in the native press will make all the officers more cautious, and the more cautious they become the better will it be for the people.

CHUNDER NATH BOSE,

Bengali Translator.

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,
The 6th June 1891.